

5/31/66 Bumped into Dick while waiting for Larry Stern to finish phone call. He asked me what I thought and I replied I thought they had been imposed upon. He asked me what I meant and I told him I had checked out all the alleged quotations from the record and found in each case less than accuracy and in too many cases the actual testimony was the opposite of what was represented. He replied, Oh, no; I read the hearing, too." I told him the letter was for him as well as Larry and possibly he might want to read the quotes first. He walked away with a deep scowl and I got the drink to which I had gone for the cooler, on the side of the office opposite his desk. Then I sat down at Larry's desk while he read it. It seems as though he were blushing while he read it. When finished I said I'd be glad to wait for Dick to read it and see if he had any comment. Just before I left Dick came up, presumably on other business, and started to read it. Larry said there were other things Dick had to do and suggested I call after lunch. By way of explanation, he quoted Willens to the effect that the Commission had made no effort to keep contradictory testimony out of the record. I do not believe he understood what he was really saying, for what else was the Commission's purpose. I suggested this was not a case subject to such explanation and pointed out I had provided him with the exact quotes, not paraphrasings. When I began to try and reach him beginning about 2:30 p.m. the phone was crazy, with either no operator answering or a busy signal most of the time. On one occasion I did get through and waited about 10 minutes. His line was busy I stopped on the way home and finally at 4:30 got him in the lunch room. He said Dick had not had a chance to read the letter, having other things he had to do. He again referred to the contradictory testimony (which in the cases cited at least for the most part doesn't exist), saying he wondered what was the "mesh" of things. I again assured him I had wrenched nothing out of context, offered to show him everything in his own 26 volumes (that wasn't the problem, he said) it was the "mesh"; offered to have Willens disprove I was wrong but with factual and cited references, and when Stern tried to say it was between Willens and me I demurred and said the Post had quoted him to my hurt, if not their own, and I declined his offer suggestion that I enter into a dialogue with Willens. I recalled to him my offer the afternoon of his meeting with Willens, that I'd talk to him if he desired under any conditions he specified, on or off the record, with or without a tape. I then said, when he declined my offer to challenge Willens to disprove my rebuttal, that he demand of Willens that he produce from the record what he had told Dick. Of course, he cannot do this and I guess by now Larry knows it. I told him I was heading home and unless I was unwell (sore throat) would be in D.C tomorrow and would phone after 10. He assented. He still did not have for return the things I had loaned them, the list of questions to Willens, the two pages of the FBI report one of the Xeroxed copies, and possibly the ms copy I had delivered to Stern at Friendly's suggestion is incomplete. It was in bad shape. In the a.m. I asked him if he knew the release date of the Epstein book and he said he didn't, to ask Dick. I didn't. Having learned from Viking the release date was 6/29 (essentially what I had understood) I informed him this p.m. He replied "I don't give a damn; this was not a review." He then offered that the L.A. Times had had a story "onday (Today is Tuesday) I asked if they'd picked it up from the Post and he said "no", that it was their own. It is now clear to me that the release date was jumped to subliminate my book, from the evidence of which Dick had not a single quote, and from all of which he had but one quote of opinion.

Re jumping Viking release, Stern said Times had it also. I told him difference Times had only notice of coming publication, which I had offered to bring him and of which I'd given him date. During a.m. conversation, re referred to alleged failure of Dallas doctors to lifet Pres. I repeated this was a booby trap, that the only thing important from Dallas was whether anterior neck was entrance, and that on this, as he admitted, everyone said entrance. Even if back was also entrance, could it not as likely, in the absence other evidence, mean two shots rather than one?

Spent much of day assuring those who had expressed varying degrees of interest of integrity of work and told the Commission's spokesman had misquoted. Offered to prove and told of delivery documentation & of this to Post. Among these were Domenick Harrod, London Telegraph (Steve in Dom. Rep) Daily Mail (about fifth chapter and "fascinated") message for Lissagor through McGaffin; message Lara, Clement, Mainichi (Hatano) Dave P., Heren, Lon Times (said he'd speak privately to Wiggins, and I agreed if private, taken by surprise at his offer but appreciating it) Jos Kraft (who has been upset by story. Copy letter in Confidence at home pm) Matthe Cole; Galbreath for Herman, seemed interested; Duke, who said call in week re Monitor; message for Wicker;